

IMAC QA Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

July 26, 2004

Members Present: John Haine, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Vicki Jessup, DHFS; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Dane County; Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

Via Conference Call: Loire Mueller, La Crosse County

Members Absent: Jackie Coutant; Milwaukee County; Joanne Ator, Door County

Administrative Items

The June 28, 2004 minutes were approved as written.

Lisa Hanson informed the committee that the Big Ten Conference is fully reserved. The conference is scheduled for August 11-13.

Status of Food Stamp Second Party Review Reports

Marilyn Rudd gave an update on the request for the Department to create a new report from the Automated Case Director (ACD) to identify error prone food stamp cases at application and re-certification, for local agency second party review. Marilyn met with Kevin Kilkenny from DHFS, who informed her that the data elements we are requesting are currently not available in the ACD. New CARES request are on hold until January 05 due to the completion of the CARES Worker Web.

Kevin provided three future possibilities:

There are three future possibilities:

1. Upgrading the data elements and history of the ACD
2. There are plans for creating an RFA universe that could include the required data
3. We are currently working on a CARES extract that examines precisely the processing of new applications and reviews. This extract could possibly be tapped for a report that would be useful for the 2nd party review process.

John Haine informed the committee that the Second Party Reviews are scheduled to start in Milwaukee County on September 13, 2004, and this ACD report is vital to selecting cases there for the Second Party. For the Find and Fix project a form targeting the 5 common error elements was used and it is recommended that this form be used for the rest of the agencies as well. The form will be sent to the

Assistant Area Administrators (AAA) who will distribute to the counties for use, and input on suggested changes.

It was recommended that in the meantime, counties should continue to use their method of sampling along with the Find and Fix form. Lisa will work with appropriate personnel in getting the form out to the AAA.

Status of contract changes for CY 2005

Bernadette reported on the proposed changes on Agency Preventable Errors (APE). There was much discussion on the amount of the error assessed to the county. The committee recommended further clarification on this matter.

EVF process and implications for QC errors

Discussion focused on the new Employee Verification Form. This matter was also brought up at the July IMAC meeting. Workers are struggling with wage information that is reported. The form is not clear and the worker has to call the employer for questionable information as reported. The income screen is not always being auto populated which is causing further delays to the process. Local agencies feel if they are fixing the errors, they should not be held liable.

All agencies are doing this process differently. The scanning of the form is another issue. The form works well in terms of the health insurance issue but is not working well in reporting wage information. The process now is that the employer returns it to the state contractor, not the worker and the customer and worker are hostage to the state contractor's timeframes and accuracy in entering the information. The customer asks daily if the document was received yet and the worker cannot do anything but wait. It was much easier for the agency to process the information.

Some employers find the form confusing. There are also issues with employees who receive tips because tips are not asked about on the form and employers are entering \$2.33/hr that they pay. Some of the agencies have reported this information to the Call Center but are concerned the Call Center is not reporting their concerns to management.

The committee recommended the following:

1. The EVF needs revisions and clarifications especially with the reported wage information.
2. The agency should not be liable for errors if that agency is fixing the information e.g. tip information.
3. The EVF should be sent directly to the agency.

Some committee members are very concerned with how the Operational Memos are written. Some counties do not feel comfortable in letting their workers train

independently due to the amount of operational changes. There is concern that distant learning is not being used by several agencies because if the supervisor is having a hard time understanding the information, then how reliable is it the worker comprehends the operational changes.

Next Meeting

September 27, 2004

Note Taker Jackie Coutant